REMARKS

Upon entry of the instant amendment, Claims 1-19 are pending. Claims 13-19 have been added, to more particularly point out Applicant's invention.

Claims 1-12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Dulman, U.S. Patent No. 5,915,008 ("Dulman") in view of Moharram, U.S. Patent No. 5,825,860 ("Moharram") and further in view of Taylor et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,400,587 ("Taylor") and Ash et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,101,451 ("Ash"). Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed invention is not taught, suggested, or implied by Dulman, Moharram, Taylor, or Ash, either singly or in combination.

As described in the Specification, one aspect of the present invention relates to a system and method for intercepting supplementary service redirection requests to a communications network and controlling resource for optimizing resource usage when setting up a call over the network. The network services control system is adapted to retrieve server identification data and to write statistical data in order to optimize network resources. A device/trunk handler is used to interface one or more incoming and outgoing signaling channels to the optimization system. A monitoring and statistics unit monitors the signaling channels when a call is made or is in progress. The server software controls the routing of the supplementary service in the network through one or more selected servers. Therefore, in a particular embodiment of the invention, when a predetermined service command is placed to the communications system, the network services control system can selectively intercept the command and reroute the call through the appropriate available servers, thereby ensuring termination to the correct user, reusing hard to get communications facilities and establishing the most optimal route to the call's final destination.

In contrast, as discussed in response to the previous Official Action, Dulman appears merely to relate to a standard telecommunications system that can offer redirection features. However, Dulman relates to allowing a user to reprovision services, i.e., redefine the services which it can use – network

management functions - by accessing a server and determining the destination of a service change request. Dulman does not appear to have anything to do with a user using the services, or how such services are, in fact, implemented at the server.

Moreover, as acknowledged in the Official Action, Dulman does not relate, inter alia, to "a server other than the original server." In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that neither Dulman nor Moharram nor Taylor nor Ash relate to, inter alia, intercepting supplementary service requests by an intervening server. Instead, Moharram provides a mediation point (MP) that receives requests from service control points (SCP) when those SCPs determine that they need "overload control." The MP does not, however, "intercept" a supplementary service request and, indeed, Moharram appears to have nothing whatsoever to do with supplementary service requests, as generally recited in the claims at issue. Taylor merely relates to rerouting a call from one trunk to another trunk or ACD which then treat the call normally. Taylor does not, however, relate to supplementary communications services or intercepting such requests before execution. Indeed, Taylor contains no hint that such interception and carrying out of supplementary services by an other-than-original server is even desirable. Ash is relied on for allegedly teaching "link optimization." Again, however, Ash does not appear to have anything to do with intercepting a supplementary service request or making a determination of its handling, as generally recited in the claims a tissue. As such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of the claims.

Claims 1-12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by Taylor et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,400,587 ("Taylor") in view of Brivet et al., U.S Patent No. 6,011,842 ("Brivet") and further in view of Dulman and Moharram. Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed invention is not taught, suggested, or implied by Taylor or Brivet, Dulman or Moharram, either singly or in combination. As discussed in response to previous Official Actions, Taylor merely relates to rerouting a call from one trunk to another trunk or ACD which then treat the call normally. Brivet is relied on for teaching supplemental services. Neither

reference, however, relates to intercepting supplemental service requests at an intervening server before execution by a destination server, as generally recited in the claims at issue. Indeed, neither Taylor nor Brivet contain a hint that such interception and carrying out of supplementary services by an other-than-original server is even desirable. Applicant notes that the Official Action also mentions Ash in terms of allegedly teaching link optimization; however, as discussed above, Ash does not appear to have anything to do with intercepting a supplementary service request or making a determination of its handling, as generally recited in the claims at issue. As such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of the claims.

Newly added claims 13-19 are believed allowable for reasons similar to those discussed above.

For all of the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance, which allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully requested,

Francis Montgomery

Francis G. Montgomery
Reg. No. 41,202

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, New Jersey 08830
(732) 321-3130